PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant	City of Sacramento	**Amount Requested**	$6,210,151
Proposal Title	American River Basin IRWM Stormwater Flood Management Grant Proposal – Downtown Combined Sewer Upsizing Project	**Total Proposal Cost**	$13,109,359

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The Downtown Combined Sewer Upsizing Project will reduce flood damage in the economically vital downtown area of Sacramento; improve water quality in the Sacramento River through the reduction in raw sewage releases into the source of drinking water for millions of Californians; and protect public health by reducing the likelihood and volume of diluted sewage on public streets and properties.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	**15/15**	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	**9/12**
Budget	**4/5**		
Schedule	**5/5**	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	**6/12**
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	**4/5**	Program Preferences	**8/10**
		Total Score (max. possible = 64)	**51**

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rational. The Work Plan contains an introduction that includes the goals and objectives of the proposal and their relationship to the adopted IRWM Plan. In addition, the introduction contains a tabulated overview of the proposed project, which includes an abstract and project status. Also, included is a regional map showing the relative project location and a brief discussion of the project's synergies and linkages among the American River Basin projects. Each proposed task is of adequate detail and completeness so that it is clear that the project can be implemented. The proposed project includes quarterly, annual, and final reports among others as work item submittals. In addition, the Work Plan includes a list of permits and their status including California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance when applicable. The application includes 60% level of design, plans and specifications, and is consistent with the design tasks

included in the Work Plan. Similarly, the submitted scientific and technical information supports the feasibility of the propose work items. Overall, the tasks collectively implement the Proposal and consist of a standalone project. The proposed Work Plan is consistent with the area's Basin Plan.

Budget

The Budgets for all the projects in the Proposal have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4 and the costs are considered reasonable but the supporting documentation for some of the Budget categories of Exhibit B are not fully supported or lack detail. Although the applicant states that some of the costs are based on the past costs of similar projects, examples of those projects were not provided. This made evaluating the adequacy of tables 5, 6, 7, and 9 difficult. Although, recognized as relatively minor, totals in tables 3, 5, 7, were not calculated accurately based on the data provided. Totals were typically off by less than $1,000.

Schedule

The Schedule is consistent and reasonable and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation of at least one project of the Proposal no later than six months the estimated award date (October 1, 2011). The Schedule is consistent and reasonable and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction no later than August 17, 2011. The Schedule is consistent with the tasks in the Budget and Work Plan.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The Project goals, desired outcomes, output indicators, outcome indicators, measurement tools and methods, and targets are lumped together in a table. The way it was presented, it appears the applicant can pick and choose outcome indicators to measure the success of the outcomes/goals. This makes it unclear which criteria were meant to work together. The project goal of improving water quality through the reduction of raw sewage releases was listed, but it was unclear how water quality would be measured. .

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits

High levels of FDR and Water Supply can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and/or supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. The models used to simulate flood events seem well-supported, but the approach used to assess monetary damages was not as careful or well documented. An average damage value per structure was assumed rather than an analysis by type of structure and inundation depth. A minor adjustment to bring the present value (PV) of benefits to a 2009 value did not change the conclusion.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality (WQ) and Other Expected Benefits

Average levels of Water Quality and Other Expected benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and/or supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. Water quality benefits were described and quantified for four categories of WQ benefits. Of these, cleanup costs belong in FDR benefits, applicability of the willingness-to-pay studies is unclear, and avoided litigation cost is speculative.

Program Preferences

The proposal demonstrates with a significant degree of certainty that a number of Program Preferences can be achieved by implementing the proposed project. Thorough documentation with breadth and magnitude

is provided for the following Program Preferences: Include Regional Projects or Programs; Contribute to Attainment of One or More of the Objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program; Practice Integrated Flood Management; Expand Environmental Stewardship; and Protect Surface and Groundwater Quality.